Thanks in advance to the FCC for bringing this important matter to the attention of the radio broadcasting community generally. I appreciate being able to file comments in this important proceeding. Additionally, I reserve the right to make additional comments at a future date within the time window given by the Commission, especially as additional comments come in prior to the deadline.

I participated in an allotment proceeding in 1980, filing supporting assignments in Docket 80-520, regarding assigning channel *219A to Tucson AZ as it's second local NCE service (then), in the old 47 CFR 73.504(b) NCE FM table, now defunct.

Oddly, the FCC used this old out of date table in relation to a proceeding which reserved *296A to Duncan AZ in lieu of the counterproposal for another channel in the vicinity, somehow the Audio Division forgot that that channel was deleted along with the entire 73.504(b) NCE FM table in the late 1980s or early 90s, I forget just when.

Docket 80-520 was decided May 7, 1981 and published in the Federal Register on May 14th, 1981. I received service by the FCC of the proceeding.

But that brings up one of the main questions here, I filed paper comments as in those days there was no Internet, no way to file electronically like you can do on almost any other proceeding now EXCEPT FM and TV allotment proceedings. 73.202(b) proceedings are often too cumbersome given the requirement to serve the Commission with paper copies of everything. I am totally in favor of making FM Table of Allotments proceedings more open to the average person to comment on by allowing both comments, reply comments, and other proceedings to be filed via ECFS, the way I'm filing these comments now.

Had that been in place for the recent Duncan AZ proceeding, I could have reminded the Commission of the defunct 73.504(b) NCE FM table, and that could have allowed Duncan to receive it's first commercial service much sooner, in fact, they could have had BOTH a commercial and NCE channel in that town, I am almost certain of that. And Safford, Thatcher, Clifton, Morenci, and Pima could have all had them too, but the old 73.504(b) NCE FM table reared it's head long after it was supposedly 'deep-sixed'. How many times do we need to beat a dead horse before we finally realize he's really dead?

The Commission also has asked for input on the matter of streamlining the 73.202(b) Table to allow for quicker reallotment of existing channels.

My thinking on this is the Commission has to be very careful on this one. What is needed here is not so much a quick way to produce a new 'rimshot' channel (small town station moves to intermediate town to serve a large metro area), but there are ways to make it possible to serve a new community of license within a station's current predicted 60dbu and/or 70dbu service contours. This is highly possible in urban centers, but there are sometimes problems in the Western US where the towns are often quite spread apart in areas.

A station should only be allowed to move if the following are all true:

1. The City of License has more than one channel assigned at the time the proponent submits the minor change application.
2. The proposed new City of License does not at the time have any local aural service. This would ensure more cities or as is often alternately used 'communities' would get new first local service.

And in some cases:

3. The station does not 'rimshot' a larger town, unless the only way to give the community local service would be to risk that.

In some cases, a whole metropolitan area could have every channel presently in the Table be eventually, via requested minor change applications, in a different community! Now THAT would be great! But I don't know if that will ever really happen. But on the other hand if it were encouraged, it would create localism beyond what the FCC had ever really envisioned. (Please refer to Docket 04-233 for more localism comments).

New 'Class A1' service. The FCC in some allotment proceedings has found that there was 'no available Class A' channels in some mutually exclusive allotment proceedings. In some case that could be resolved using a lower-powered class that could be shoehorned in more readily. I propose a 'Class A1' service, full-power status, with the following operating parameters:

1500 Watts ERP.
50 Meters HAAT.

That would service roughly less than half to one-third the area of present Class A stations. But it would allow for a station to cover easily a moderately-sized area, including small cities, without interfering with stations that would otherwise be short-spaced to a Class A station (6kw ERP at 100 meters HAAT).

Can the Commission/Audio Division come back with a rulemaking for this type of service, complete with a complement of initial Class A1 allotments, and as much as possible have these initial allotments be first local aural service to communities that would otherwise not ever be able to be serviced by a full-power station?

This would not be conflicting with the LPFM service, because it would allow for that, because there will still be many situations where a Class A1 channel would not fit, allowing for the LPFM to exist alongside all the existing stations of any class. There will still be thousands of situations outside of Class A1 allotments that would permit LPFMs in many areas, mainly due to spacing matters, etc.

Back to streamlining the process. Yes, I would also require new station applications with any new allotment proceeding. That will allow the Commission staff reviewing the allotment to see where the station might be in context. Up until now, they have only been able to make the best guess based on 'reference coordinates', often ignored at the time of application for the vacant channel alloted.

The Commission also sought comments on limiting the number of proposals in any given allotment docket. Yes, it is possible to limit the number of moves, but, it can also stifle the desire for a 'preferential arrangement of allotments', if taken to an extreme. The Commission on its own should look at the matter, and based on the next item (see paragraphs on 'preclusion studies', infra), decide whether to let the docket proceed as is or ask the proponent(s) to pare it down.

There is something else that needs to be brought back to the fore. Prior to probably after Docket 80-520, there used to be a requirement for an allotment proponent to submit a 'preclusion study'. What this was had to do with how many nearby communities would be precluded from having a first local aural service (and I believe in some proceedings second local service was included as well). Bring back that requirement, but limit it to requiring a showing of how many communities would still be able to get a channel allotted, along with a list of who would not. Most likely it should be at least the listing of communities that would NOT be able to obtain an allotment as a result of the given docket, the Commission should decide if either or both should be the way to demonstrate preclusion studies for the purposes of determining allotting channels.

I'll have more later, hope to be hearing more on this soon.